

## BEFORE THE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

## STATE OF WASHINGTON

LARRY MACK.

Appellant,

V.

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS.

Respondent.

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

—

Case No. ALLO-00-0039

## ORDER OF THE BOARD FOLLOWING HEARING ON EXCEPTIONS TO THE DETERMINATION OF THE DIRECTOR

**Hearing on Exceptions.** This appeal came on for hearing before the Personnel Appeals Board, GERALD L. MORGEN, Vice Chair, and LEANA D. LAMB, Member. The hearing was held on March 7, 2001, in the Personnel Appeals Board hearing room in Olympia, Washington. WALTER T. HUBBARD, Chair, did not participate in the hearing or in the decision in this matter.

**Appearances.** Appellant Larry Mack was present and was represented by Rick Engelhart, Business Agent for Teamsters Local 313. Shirley Reis, Human Resource Consultant, represented Respondent Department of Corrections (DOC).

**Background.** Appellant requested a review of the allocation of his Stationary Engineer 2 position. By letter dated May 4, 2000, Respondent determined that Appellant's position was properly allocated. On May 25, 2000, Appellant appealed that decision to the Director of the Department of Personnel. The Director's designee, Paul Peterson, conducted a review of Appellant's position. By letter dated October 19, 2000, the Director determined that Appellant's position was properly allocated. On November 14, 2000, Appellant filed exceptions to the Director's determination. Appellant's exceptions are the subject of this proceeding.

**Appearances.** Appellant Larry Mack was present and was represented by Rick Engelhart, Business Agent for Teamsters Local 313. Shirley Reis, Human Resource Consultant, represented Respondent Department of Corrections (DOC).

Respondent Department of Corrections (DOC).

**Background.** Appellant requested a review of the allocation of his Stationary Engineer 2 position. By letter dated May 4, 2000, Respondent determined that Appellant's position was properly allocated. On May 25, 2000, Appellant appealed that decision to the Director of the Department of Personnel. The Director's designee, Paul Peterson, conducted a review of Appellant's position. By letter dated October 19, 2000, the Director determined that Appellant's position was properly allocated. On November 14, 2000, Appellant filed exceptions to the Director's determination. Appellant's exceptions are the subject of this proceeding.

**Background.** Appellant requested a review of the allocation of his Stationary Engineer 2 position. By letter dated May 4, 2000, Respondent determined that Appellant's position was properly allocated. On May 25, 2000, Appellant appealed that decision to the Director of the Department of Personnel. The Director's designee, Paul Peterson, conducted a review of Appellant's position. By letter dated October 19, 2000, the Director determined that Appellant's position was properly allocated. On November 14, 2000, Appellant filed exceptions to the Director's determination. Appellant's exceptions are the subject of this proceeding.

By letter dated May 4, 2000, Respondent determined that Appellant's position was properly allocated. On May 25, 2000, Appellant appealed that decision to the Director of the Department of Personnel. The Director's designee, Paul Peterson, conducted a review of Appellant's position. By letter dated October 19, 2000, the Director determined that Appellant's position was properly allocated. On November 14, 2000, Appellant filed exceptions to the Director's determination. Appellant's exceptions are the subject of this proceeding.

By letter dated May 4, 2000, Respondent determined that Appellant's position was properly allocated. On May 25, 2000, Appellant appealed that decision to the Director of the Department of Personnel. The Director's designee, Paul Peterson, conducted a review of Appellant's position. By letter dated October 19, 2000, the Director determined that Appellant's position was properly allocated. On November 14, 2000, Appellant filed exceptions to the Director's determination. Appellant's exceptions are the subject of this proceeding.

allocated. On May 25, 2000, Appellant appealed that decision to the Director of the Department of Personnel. The Director's designee, Paul Peterson, conducted a review of Appellant's position. By letter dated October 19, 2000, the Director determined that Appellant's position was properly allocated. On November 14, 2000, Appellant filed exceptions to the Director's determination. Appellant's exceptions are the subject of this proceeding.

Personnel. The Director's designee, Paul Peterson, conducted a review of Appellant's position. By letter dated October 19, 2000, the Director determined that Appellant's position was properly allocated. On November 14, 2000, Appellant filed exceptions to the Director's determination. Appellant's exceptions are the subject of this proceeding.

letter dated October 19, 2000, the Director determined that Appellant's position was properly allocated. On November 14, 2000, Appellant filed exceptions to the Director's determination. Appellant's exceptions are the subject of this proceeding.

allocated. On November 14, 2000, Appellant filed exceptions to the Director's determination. Appellant's exceptions are the subject of this proceeding.

Appellant's exceptions are the subject of this proceeding.

Appellant's exceptions are the subject of this proceeding.

Appellant's exceptions are the subject of this proceeding.

1 Appellant is employed at the Monroe Correctional Complex. Appellant works the swing shift and  
2 is responsible for maintaining and operating the steam and emergency power generation plant.  
3 Appellant is supervised by the Plant Manager.

4  
5 **Summary of Appellant's Argument.** Appellant argues that his responsibilities go beyond tending  
6 the power plant and asserts that he has overall responsibility for the plant during his shift, which is  
7 consistent with the definition of the Stationary Engineer 3 classification.. Appellant contends that  
8 he responds to emergencies during the swing shift because his supervisor is not available.  
9 Appellant also argues that he supervises up to three offenders at any given time and that he is  
10 responsible for the pass down between shifts.

11  
12 **Summary of Respondent DOC's Argument.** Respondent argues that historically, the Stationary  
13 Engineer 3 classification has been used for positions with overall responsibility for the 24-hour  
14 operation of the power plant. Respondent asserts that Appellant is the plant operator for the swing  
15 shift only. Respondent contends that Appellant's position fits the description of the Stationary  
16 Engineer 2 classification.

17  
18 **Primary Issue.** Whether the Director's determination that Appellant's position should be allocated  
19 to the Stationary Engineer 2 classification should be affirmed.

20  
21 **Relevant Classifications.** Stationary Engineer 2, class code 75120, and Stationary Engineer 3,  
22 class code 75140.

23  
24 **Decision of the Board.** The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best  
25 describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a  
26 measurement of the volume of work performed nor an evaluation of the expertise with which that

1 work is performed. Also, a position review is not a comparison of work performed by employees in  
2 similar positions. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a particular  
3 position to the available classification specifications. This review results in a determination of the  
4 class which best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. Liddle-Stamper v.  
5 Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

6  
7 Salary inequity is not an allocation criteria and should not be considered when determining the  
8 appropriate allocation of a position. Even if class specifications become outdated as functions of  
9 positions evolve, the Personnel Appeals Board is not the proper entity to rewrite class  
10 specifications. Sorenson v. Dep't of Social and Health Services, PAB No. A94-020 (1995).

11  
12 The Stationary Engineer 3 classification encompasses positions that supervise the total operation  
13 and maintenance of a high pressure heating plant consisting of two or more boilers over 150 h.p.  
14 each. Incumbents have final responsibility and authority for the overall safety, welfare, and  
15 maintenance within all operations of the plant. This classification is intended to encompass  
16 positions that have 24-hour responsibility for the plant. Appellant has responsibility for his shift.  
17 He does not have final responsibility and authority for all operations of the plant. Appellant's  
18 position does not have the level of responsibility required for allocation to the Stationary Engineer 3  
19 classification.

20  
21 The Stationary Engineer 2 classification encompasses positions that have shift responsibility for the  
22 operation of a high pressure power boiler system consisting of two or more boilers over 150 h.p.  
23 each. Incumbents are totally responsible for the operation of all generating equipment in the  
24 heating plant during his or her shift. In addition, incumbents must be able to exercise independent  
25 judgment and make decisions concerning operations and safety activities of the heating plant during  
26 his or her shift. Appellant's position fits within this description and his level of responsibility is

1 consistent with the intent of the classification. Appellant's position is described by the Stationary  
2 Engineer 2 classification.

3  
4 **Conclusion.** Appellant's appeal on exceptions should be denied and the determination of the  
5 Director, dated October 19, 2000, should be affirmed and adopted.

6  
7 **ORDER**

8 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Appellant is  
9 denied and the Director's determination dated October 19, 2000, is affirmed and adopted. A copy is  
10 attached.

11 DATED this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2001.

12 WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

13  
14 \_\_\_\_\_  
Gerald L. Morgen, Vice, Chair

15  
16 \_\_\_\_\_  
Leana D. Lamb, Member